

M.2 EVALUATION APPROACH

(a) General. The contract award will be based on the evaluation of three factors: Mission Suitability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), and Cost/Price (Volume III).

(1) This provision is intended to explain the rationale and precise criteria by which proposals will be assessed by the evaluation team. Offerors are to prepare proposals with these criteria in mind (i.e., in terms of both content and organization), in order to assist the team in determining the relative merit of proposals in relation to the requirements as defined in the Statement of Work.

(2) The Government may award a contract based on the initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each offeror shall submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint.

(3) Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Offerors must recognize that the initial evaluation of proposals and the determination of the competitive range, if any, will be made upon a review of the proposals only, plus some independent investigations that may be made with regard to Past Performance. Discussions will be held only if award on the basis of initial offers is determined not to be in the Government's best interest. If written or oral discussions are conducted, the Government will seek revised proposals from offerors within the competitive range.

(4) At the conclusion of discussions (if applicable), as stipulated in FAR 15.307, a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be requested from all offerors still within the competitive range. The FPR shall be submitted in the form of a contractual document (including revisions to the original proposal) that has been executed by an individual with the authority to bind the offeror. Selection will be made in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth below. Contract award will be made without subsequent discussions or negotiation.

(5) The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) will present its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA). The SSA's decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation.

(b) Evaluation Factors. There are three evaluation factors for this procurement: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. A general definition of these factors may be found at NFS 1815.304, "Evaluation factors and significant subfactors." Specific information regarding each factor is provided below:

(1) Mission Suitability Factor The Mission Suitability factor indicates, for each offeror, the merit or excellence of the work to be performed and the ability of the offeror to accomplish what is offered, or the product to be delivered. The Mission Suitability Factor is rated by adjective and numerically scored in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3), "Technical Evaluation," and the following table.

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS	PERCENTILE RANGE
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.	91-100
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates overall competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.	71-90
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a	51-70

	reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response.	
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.	31-50
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.	0-30

Overall, the offeror's Mission Suitability proposal will be evaluated based on the offeror's ability to fulfill the technical and management oversight requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements. The compatibility between the proposed technical approach and proposed total compensation to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor. In addition, proposal risk will be evaluated with respect to cost and performance or technical and managerial aspects.

(2) Past Performance Factor. This factor indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of each offeror's record of performing services or delivering products similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition. This factor provides an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services provided by the offerors to the agency and other organizations as either a prime or subcontractor.

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the contractor's performance under previously awarded contracts. The past performance evaluation is an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation shall be in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and 1815.305(a)(2). When applying the definitions below to arrive at a confidence rating, the SEC's evaluation shall clearly document each Offeror's relevant past performance and the currency of the past performance to assess the Offeror's overall confidence rating assigned. Past Performance shall be evaluated for each offeror using the following levels of confidence ratings:

<u>LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE RATINGS</u>	
<u>Very High Level of Confidence</u>	The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist.) The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet the requirements for a Very High Level of Confidence.)
<u>High Level of Confidence</u>	The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)
<u>Moderate Level of Confidence</u>	The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)

<u>Low Level of Confidence</u>	The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)
<u>Very Low Level of Confidence</u>	The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)
<u>Neutral</u>	In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

(3) Cost/Price Factor. This factor is used to assess what each offeror's proposal will cost the Government should it be selected for award. Proposed costs are analyzed to determine the cost/price and associated risks of doing business with an offeror based upon the offeror's proposed approach for the proposed price. A cost realism analysis will be performed to assess the reasonableness and realism of the proposed costs. It is not numerically scored.

(c) Mission Suitability Factor (Volume 1). The Offeror's Mission Suitability proposal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements. The compatibility between the proposed technical approach and the overall resources proposed to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor. In addition, proposal risk will be evaluated with respect to cost, performance, technical approach, and management approach. Mission Suitability subfactors will be assigned adjectival ratings and numerical scores. Information submitted in Volume I of the proposal that is not relevant to the Mission Suitability factor will not be evaluated, except that if the SEC determines that a proposal does not adequately demonstrate that the offeror will be able to perform the work with the resources proposed, the SEC may determine this to be a mission suitability weakness as well as require an adjustment for probable cost. This integration between mission suitability findings and probable cost adjustments is critical to accomplishing cost realism.

The Offerors will be evaluated and scored based on the Mission Suitability subfactors set forth below.

Note: the following outline should not be construed as an indication of the order of importance or relative weighting within individual elements of the Mission Suitability subfactors as there are no discrete point values to any of the elements.

INDEX OF MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTORS AND ELEMENTS

SUBFACTOR	ELEMENT
(1) Management Approach	
	a. Organizational Structure and Approach
	b. Staffing, Recruitment, Retention and Training
	c. Key Positions and Key Personnel
	d. Total Compensation Plan
	e. Phase-In Plan

	f. RESERVED
	g. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan
(2) Technical Approach	
(3) Safety and Health Plan	

The Mission Suitability proposal will be evaluated based on completeness with respect to the elements listed in Section L, the degree of understanding of the functions and tasks to be performed and the different disciplines involved, and how these disciplines are to be applied to current and future NASA facilities, programs and projects supported by this contract. Simply restating the Statement of Work (SOW) will be unacceptable and evaluated as such. The narrative evaluation will be based on:

(1) Subfactor 1. Management Approach

a. The offerors proposed Management Approach will be evaluated with consideration of the elements reflected in the Index of Mission Suitability Subfactors and Elements above.

(i) **Organizational Structure and Approach**

The offeror's approach to organizing, directing, and controlling the diverse functions of the Statement of Work will be evaluated, as well as the following:

- The offeror's proposed management structure, functions, lines of authority, and reporting system, as well as the structural connections or associations of the entities responsible for this work with any corporate or division organizations and any subcontractors, will be evaluated on applicability to the anticipated type of work described in the SOW and on innovativeness in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.
- Reasonableness of and rationale for the levels of authority and responsibility vested in site and technical task managers and their access to corporate or company resources to support the contract through all phases.
- Effectiveness of proposed process(es) for managing the contract including contract modifications, task modifications, handling changing environments, and problem resolution techniques.
- Effectiveness of the offeror's corporate resource base beyond that required for the on-site staff will be evaluated by considering the offeror's corporate ability and commitment to support such things as short-notice backup for other than key personnel, subcontracting services, materials procurement, travel arrangements, and other "home office" management or technical services which may assist or augment on-site capability when needed; as well as the process for on-site management's access to corporate resources
- Effectiveness of the offeror's plans for tracking and controlling all work, supervising and monitoring performance including methods for monitoring, maintaining and enhancing the quality of work, and maintaining customer satisfaction will be evaluated.
- Effectiveness of the offeror's approach for accommodating short-term increases in the workload, personnel absences, temporary assignments, and plans to maximize the flexibility (cross-utilization) of the work force (both Key and Non-Key personnel) will be evaluated.
- Adequacy of processes to ensure appropriate employee interaction with task requesters and other Government personnel regarding assignment of work. Effectiveness of proposed approach to training employees the proper process for assignment of work, to preventing and handling improper direction outside of the approved task order process and for dealing with potential hostile workplace issues.

- Adequacy of the offeror's approach to issues involved in managing a fluctuating workload.
- Demonstrated corporate commitment to and effectiveness in promoting safety in the workplace.
- The efficient and effective use of any proposed subcontracting and cooperative business arrangements, including the operational and technical benefits to NASA, and the effectiveness of the offeror's approach for managing these arrangements to ensure that the government receives quality support.
- Availability of services, facilities, equipment and staff assistance, both internal and external to the offeror that may be required to augment on-site resources, the adequacy of the process to obtain these resources and the corporate commitment and flexibility to provide them. The description of the anticipated circumstances under which these resources could be called upon, including providing technical consulting, human resources, procurement, and legal will be evaluated for appropriateness.

(ii) Management of CTOs (Contract Task Orders). The offeror's process for responding to and managing task order requests will be evaluated with consideration to the following:

- Adequacy of the offeror's approach to the management and planning process, analysis and risk assessment techniques, and system for the development of cost and schedule estimates will be assessed for their simplicity, thoroughness, timeliness, realism and applicability to a wide range of task orders
- Effectiveness and efficiency of proposed technical and business management process to be used to determine task staffing, direction, control, and the tracking and reporting on CTO status
- Effectiveness of the offeror's approach to planning and managing the execution of multiple task orders, changing tasks, task priorities, resources, and schedules in a timely, efficient, and cost effective manner, including the proposed approach to handling multiple task requests competing for limited workforce and skill sets
- Demonstrated understanding of complex issues that may arise during task planning and performance, and effectiveness of approaches to resolution of those issues and the process for informing the NASA task requester.
- Effectiveness of the offeror's proposed process for reporting technical and schedule status, and pricing issues to the NASA Contracting Officer and COTR
- Effectiveness of the offeror's proposed approach to address changing requirements, including increases or decreases in workload that cause changes in required skill sets.
- The effectiveness of the offeror's proposed approach to identifying task performance problems and implementing corrective actions.

b. Staffing, Recruitment, Retention and Training.

The Offeror's approach to and rationale for the following will be evaluated to determine appropriateness, reasonableness, effectiveness, and efficiency:

The plan's completeness with respect to the skill categories listed in Attachment J.1 (b) Government Labor Estimate, and the plan's applicability, flexibility, effectiveness, efficiency, risks, realism of assumptions, including the offeror's knowledge and awareness of the sample positions and local job market.

- Adequacy of proposed staffing plan including assignments, distribution, and skills required for other-than-key personnel
- Completeness and adequacy of approach to, and processes for, recruiting, hiring, training (including internal training, mentoring, and career development) and retaining a highly qualified, diverse workforce
- Effectiveness of approach to address any difficulties anticipated in fulfilling the staffing requirements of this contract and the plans to overcome those difficulties
- Effectiveness of approach to, and responsibilities for, setting employee performance standards, for maintaining performance at those standards, and for establishing employee performance incentives
- Effectiveness of plans for dealing with underperforming employees
- Demonstrated understanding of potential difficulties for accommodating short-term increases in the workload including provision for short notice, rapid (within 10 calendar days) recruitment of experienced and qualified personnel (other than key personnel), personnel absences and temporary assignments, and for maximizing the flexibility (cross-utilization) of the workforce, for both Key and Non-Key Personnel.
- Completeness and adequacy of proposed subcontracting arrangements to meet changing contract requirements

c. Key Positions and Key Personnel

The appropriateness and reasonableness of the offeror's proposal for Key Positions and Key Personnel will be evaluated for the following:

- Completeness and appropriateness of Key Positions and the rationale, including authority and responsibilities, for designating them as Key. Completeness and appropriateness of the position descriptions, authorities, responsibilities, and assignments of the positions, as well as the experience and skills required of the Key Personnel filling the position.
- Reasonableness of allocation of key positions between the prime and any proposed subcontractors.
- Suitability of the individuals proposed including education, summary of experience in similar work, other applicable experience, and three (3) professional references.
- Adequacy of, and rationale for, percentage of time to be devoted to key position duties.
- Demonstration of an adequate degree of commitment of the individual(s) proposed
- Appropriateness of the on-site manager's post-award authority level.
- Realism of proposal for providing backup for Key Personnel during absences due to vacation, illness, etc.
- Adequacy of plan for recruitment, hiring, replacement or addition of key personnel, when necessary

d. Total Compensation Plan.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Total Compensation Plan for all personnel proposed, in accordance with NFS provision 1852.231-71, "Determination of Compensation Reasonableness," and FAR provision 52.222-46, "Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees." The plan will be evaluated for:

- Salary ranges and fringe benefits proposed for employees that demonstrate a clear understanding of the local employment market. The breakdown of salaries/wages, along with an itemization of the benefits that require employee contributions and the amount of that contribution as a percentage of the total cost of the benefit will be evaluated. The charts containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the exempt labor categories and containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the non-exempt labor categories will be evaluated.
- The impact that the proposed compensation will have on recruiting and retaining professional employees (as defined in 29 CFR 541).
- Reasonableness of employee compensation regarding: vacations, severance pay, holidays, overtime and shift differentials, sick leave, California Family Leave Act, bonus plans, life insurance, medical/dental/vision insurance, uncompensated overtime, pension contributions, employee incentives, training, career development, moving expenses, and compensatory time. Reasonableness of the employee contributions to their compensation.
- Reasonableness of proposed uncompensated overtime, rationale, and proposed labor categories.
- Reasonableness of the distribution of benefits charges (e.g., direct labor cost, G&A, Overhead, or Fee.)

e. Phase-in Plan

The Offeror's approach to and rationale for the following will be evaluated to determine completeness, reasonableness, effectiveness, and efficiency:

- Thoroughness of risk identification and effectiveness of proposed mitigation approaches and strategies.
- Proactive approaches to ensuring efficient continuation of current operations during contract transition, addressing issues typically encountered during the initial and ongoing transition of personnel.
- Offeror's general rationale and approaches for hiring or replacing incumbent personnel
- Proposed key or other personnel (by title and function), and their availability, who will participate during the phase-in and adequacy of the rationale for them.
- Estimate of, and supporting rationale for, the number of incumbent contractor employees the offeror expects to hire.
- The impact of the Offeror's policy for continuing or replacing the benefits of the incumbent contractor's employees the offeror expects to hire (e.g., seniority, accrued sick and annual leave, compensatory time, health plans, 401k plans, etc.).
- Demonstrated understanding of foreign national access issues and restrictions, and adequacy of plan to ensure continuity of employee productivity regardless of citizenship status.

f. RESERVED

g. Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan – Written Proposal

The contractor's Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan will be evaluated for a complete and comprehensive response to ensuring compliance with and assurances that all safeguards are in place to maintain control, handling and non-disclosure of sensitive data in conformance with contract requirements. Specifically, the Plan will be evaluated to ensure it addresses all the requirements

identified in Section H Clauses, H.x *Organizational Conflicts of Interest, and Limitation on Future Contracting*, H.x *ARC 52.227-93 Management and Protection of Data*, H.x *ARC 52.227-96 Handling of Data*, and Section I Clause *NFS 1852.237-72, Access to Sensitive Information* relative to the offeror's understanding and proposed methodology for implementation of the above contract requirements

(1) Subfactor 2: Technical Approach:

Each proposal will be examined to evaluate the Offeror's overall understanding of the requirement and technical approach. Restating the Statement of Work (SOW) will not be interpreted as demonstrating understanding.

a. Operations Plan

The Offeror's operations plan will be evaluated on how well it demonstrates its comprehension of each of the requirements of the SOW under all functional areas and specifically addresses how the work will be accomplished. The proposal will be evaluated based on the soundness, innovativeness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the proposed functional approach. Specifically, the following will be evaluated:

- How the broad spectrum of functional areas of the SOW will be managed in a coherent, integrated manner that will meet each of the requirements defined in the Statement of Work.
- How the proposal presents a complete, balanced, and consistent approach, and clearly demonstrates an understanding of all the functional areas of the Statement of Work (SOW).
- The realism, effectiveness, and innovativeness of the offeror's proposed approach to staying abreast of current NASA policies and procedures and adopting them where appropriate.
- Identification of potential risks to the successful fulfillment of the requirements and recommended approaches to minimize the probability and impact of those risks.
- The offeror's proposed approaches to enhance workflow, increase productivity, enhance communications, improve quality, and reduce cost including the use of IT resources. Innovative approaches, the justification and expected advantage to the Government.
- Approach for responding to task requests, planning work and accomplishing task requirements and approach for identifying, reporting and resolving typical problems that may be encountered in satisfying the requirements of the SOW.
- Approach for responding to changing requirements to task order skill sets caused by project and/or other task order revisions.
- Plans to provide the offeror's own equipment (either in addition to, or in place of, Government-provided equipment).

(3) Subfactor 3. Safety and Health.

The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for a complete and comprehensive response to the management of safety and health hazards that will be expected during the course of this contract in accordance with NPR 8715.3A and APR 1700.1. The Offeror's approach and understanding to the following will be evaluated to determine soundness, technical merit, innovativeness, efficiency, and effectiveness:

- (1) Statement of the corporate policy and program goals concerning safety and health.
- (2) Safety and Health program management structure, including whether the plan clearly defines safety assignments and specific safety roles to individuals by name and title.

- (3) Safety management program elements, including whether the plan appropriately covers techniques for achieving program goals and includes:
- Methods to make certain that clear statements of hazardous situations and necessary cautions are in documents which detail operations, such as inspection, test, and operating procedures.
 - Means for ensuring that every employee understands how to recognize hazards and how to avoid having mishaps.
 - Procedures for training and certification of personnel performing potentially hazardous operations. Identify certifications and corresponding training requirements and/or physical conditions that are required to perform work.
 - Controls over the procurement, storage, issuance, and use of hazardous substances and procedures for management of hazardous waste.
 - Controls for special hazardous materials and processes, such as lasers, explosives, biohazards, power-actuated hand tools, high-pressure devices, etc.
 - Method of making sure that emergency plans and procedures are current and sufficient.
 - Method for making sure that employees consistently perform their work safely and in accordance with the plan.
 - Method for reporting and investigating accidents and incidents (mishaps).

(d) Past Performance Factor (Volume II).

(1) By acquiring and reviewing information from a variety of sources, the Government will evaluate each Offeror's suitability to fulfill the requirements of this contract. The Government will evaluate the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the Offeror and major subcontractors. Specifically, the Government will evaluate information on past and current performance regarding relevant technical performance, contract management, and corporate structure.

The explanations and amounts of cost growth will be evaluated. The reasons for any terminations for default, environmental or safety violations and schedule slips will also be evaluated.

(2) By reviewing references of past and active relevant technical performance, the Government will evaluate the offeror's and major subcontractors' experience level in working with systems that are similar in complexity and function as those that will be worked on under this contract. The past relevant technical performance review will allow the Government to evaluate the depth of the offeror's and major subcontractors' experience, whether newly acquired or established over time. The technical review will also allow the Government to evaluate the degree of successfulness with which the offeror and major subcontractors have satisfied technical requirements of projects on past and active contracts.

(3) A review of offerors' and major subcontractors' performance of past and active contract management will allow the Government to evaluate the effectiveness, timeliness, and successfulness of in-place procedures and processes in the areas of contract, subcontract and task management, human resources, procurement, and subcontracting goals, if applicable. The Government evaluation will consider evidence of past and present contract management performance that displays simple and efficient procedures and processes. The Government evaluation will consider serious performance problems, any termination for default, any environmental violations, and any safety violations cited. The evaluation will include a human resources review that will look for a record of retention of a stable, technically qualified, motivated work force, with allowances for fluctuations in the work force reflecting workload fluctuations. The efficiency of the offeror's procurement system will be evaluated, favoring those that reflect expeditious procurements that meet Government procurement regulations.

(4) The review of the offeror's corporate management responsiveness will allow the

Government to evaluate current and past performance that was affected by the position of the offeror in relation to its overall corporate management hierarchy and to gain insight into the lines of authority to which the offeror has been subjected during the performance of contracts. The corporate management evaluation will favor offerors that display evidence of operations free from an unwarranted number of intrusive, day-to-day work hindering decisions from an entity other than the one that is to perform the work under this contract. In doing so, the Government will be looking for entities that will be able to function relatively autonomously, free from decisions made by "outside" entities that would have negative impacts on satisfying task or contract requirements. If the Government does not see evidence of this type of autonomy, it will consider the degree and effectiveness of authority that another entity displayed and exerted over the entity that will be performing the work under this contract. In this case, the evaluation may consider the performance record of both entities. The evaluation will consider performing entities that exhibit little or no authority over their own operations as unacceptable.

(5) The Government reserves the right to evaluate past performance information from subcontractors other than major subcontractors that may be deemed critical by the Government, and from entities that will substantially contribute to the proposed contract, or have the potential to significantly impact performance of the proposed contract.

(6) If an offeror does not have any relevant past performance history as determined herein, it will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably and will be given a neutral level of assessment.

(7) Other Information:

a. Past Performance Evaluation Criteria The past performance of the offeror and major subcontractors will be thoroughly evaluated in the following areas: Relevant Technical Performance, Contract Management, and Corporate Management Responsiveness. The Government will also evaluate other information submitted by the offeror and major subcontractors as well as information from other sources as described in Section L.

1. *Relevant Technical Performance.* The Government will review recent and active contracts to determine the relevancy of the experience to the work anticipated to be performed under this proposed contract. Also, the Government will review relevant recent and active contracts and assess the quality of the technical work performed under those contracts. The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the offeror and major subcontractors. In evaluating technical performance, consideration will be given to the following:

- Compliance with technical and schedule requirements, including the offeror's explanation of any schedule slips
- Contractor flexibility and effectiveness in dealing with changes to technical requirements
- Innovative and resource-efficient solutions to satisfy technical requirements
- Key personnel performance and relevant experience
- Accuracy and completeness of technical documentation

2. *Contract Management.* The Government will evaluate the offeror's and major subcontractors' recent and current performance in the area of contract management. The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the offeror and major subcontractors. In evaluating contract management, consideration will be given to the following:

- The management of both small and large tasks as well as the simultaneous management of a large number of varied tasks without constant, direct customer oversight. The approach for responding to short-term high demand requirements
- Conformance with the terms and conditions of contracts, including delivery of products and reports, and adherence to cost and schedule constraints
- Subcontract management
- Customer interactions
- Record of recruiting, developing, and retaining highly skilled employees to address contract objectives
- Ability to assess and re-assign staff based on performance
- Problems encountered and their resolutions
- Process and results of contract change implementation and/or negotiation of contract changes
- Performance of the procurement system
- Safety record including protection of employees
- History of handling labor relation problems
- Retention of incumbent contractor employees during first year of contract, for which the offeror was not the incumbent
- Management of the phase-in period to ensure efficient continuation of operations, in cases where the offeror was not the incumbent
- Ability to identify and mitigate risks (including risks associated with cost, schedule, deliverables and milestones), ensuring mission success.

3. **Corporate Management Responsiveness.** The Government will evaluate the offeror's and major subcontractors' corporate relevant past performance, and the relationship of the offeror to any entities within the corporation that will substantially contribute to the proposed contract or have the potential to significantly impact the proposed contract, and how well they have worked together in the past. The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the offeror and major subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the impact of the offeror's, major subcontractor's, and other entities' decisions in the following areas.

- Qualifications and effectiveness of on-site management and level of autonomy the site manager had to manage the contract
- Responsiveness of corporate management to contract problems
- Extent of corporate management involvement in the operation of the contract
- Availability of corporate resources
- Stability and performance of the contractor work force
- Changes made to lines of authority during the contract and their impact to contract performance
- Management of performance problems encountered and their resolutions
- Ability to operate free from organizational conflicts of interest

4. **Other Information.** The Government will also evaluate the following for all relevant contracts and for

all NASA contracts as listed in the “Relevant Contract Chart” provided in Section L:

- Relevancy of past performance information of predecessor companies, relevant experience of key personnel, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement
- Effectiveness of recruiting actions taken; including skill sets required, recruitment processes, and hiring success rates
- Reasonableness of rate of loss of Key Personnel, and success in hiring actions to fill vacant Key Positions
- Management of processes for hiring foreign nationals of varying immigration status
- Effectiveness in engaging personnel in continuous improvement processes and in establishing, maintaining, and improving corporate values and high morale
- Demonstrated improvements in personnel management and technical performance, and the metrics used to measure the improvement
- Relevant significant awards and certifications received during the past 5 years
- Any serious performance problems, termination for default, environmental violations or safety violations cited
- Relevancy of Labor Unions Claims (if any) against the offeror over the past 5 years with an emphasis placed on the number of claims filed, the outcome of each claim and how it was resolved, in addition to trends of incidences
- Adequacy and currency of management system(s) reviews (e.g., purchasing, accounting, property, estimating), including the type of review, the results of the review, the cognizant Government agency making the review, systems approvals, if any, and the last date of a system approval
- Effectiveness of phase-in plan for all contracts in which the offeror was not the incumbent, including processes to ensure smooth transition; retention rates for key personnel and technical personnel; technical milestones met or slipped, other pertinent issues, and lessons learned
- Effectiveness of responding to short-term or long-term contract growth, including approach to dealing with increased workload, or of contract de-scoping
- Effectiveness of response to major changes to contract scope that resulted in modifications to existing skill sets

The Government reserves the right to evaluate past performance information from subcontractors other than major subcontractors that may be deemed critical by the Government, and from organizations that will substantially contribute to the proposed contract, or have the potential to significantly impact performance of the proposed contract.

Past performance will also be evaluated based on information obtained through the NASA Past Performance Data Base (PPDB) or similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources.

If an offeror does not have any relevant past performance history as determined herein, it will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably and will be given a neutral level of assessment.

b. Past Performance Ratings: The Government will obtain past performance information as stated in Section L. The Government will evaluate this information in accordance with the criteria below and assign strengths and weaknesses. The results of this evaluation will be consolidated into an adjectival rating.

Past performance will also be evaluated based on information obtained through the NASA Past Performance Database (PPDB) or similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Agency

(DCMA) channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources.

Offerors are notified that, in conducting an assessment of past performance, the government reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources.

(e) Cost/Price Factor (Volume III).

(1) The overall price for evaluation purposes will be the price calculated for the Government Pricing Model, exclusive of Phase-In costs.

(2) The offeror's proposal will be evaluated to determine if the fully burdened IDIQ labor rates are reasonable. Subcontractor rates will also be evaluated. A line-by-line analysis will be performed on this section of the proposal. An offer is considered materially unbalanced when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. The proposal will be evaluated on the best value to the Government, not solely on the lowest priced work.

(3) The price of phase-in will not be included in the evaluated total price, but will be evaluated in terms of risk assessment for selection purposes. This consideration involves performing an analysis of the proposed phase-in price which may lead to mission suitability weaknesses, and adversely affect mission suitability scores, if the proposed resources are not consistent with the proposed phase-in plan.

(4) Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

(End of Provision)

M.3 WEIGHTING AND SCORING

(a) The essential objective of the proposal process is to identify and select the contractor able to successfully meet the Government's needs in the manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. The relative probabilities of offerors to accomplish this will be judged by evaluation of specific factors. These factors are described in M.2, 52.215-104 (Evaluation Approach).

(b) The Mission Suitability Factor will be rated by adjective and numerically weighted and scored in accordance with the numerical system established below. The other factors (i.e., Past Performance and Cost/Price) are not similarly weighted or scored. Past Performance is assigned an assessment level. Cost/Price will be evaluated for realism and a confidence level rating will be assigned. The Source Selection Authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals pursuant to source selection criteria prescribed in this solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment.

(c) **Of the evaluation factors identified above, Mission Suitability is somewhat more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is significantly more important than Cost.** The Mission Suitability and Past Performance factors, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Offerors should note that items within any factor, if found to be unsatisfactory, may be the basis for rejection of an offer.

(d) The numerical weights assigned to the subfactors are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas. The Mission Suitability subfactors to be evaluated are weighted for purposes of assigning numerical scores as follows:

Subfactor	Assigned Weight
Management Approach	500
Technical Understanding	450

Safety and Health	50
Total	1,000

(End of Provision)
(End of Section)

DRAFT